



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

(H)

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/051,560	01/17/2002	Gary M. Sanderson	NORTH-458A/ A-2360	9653
7663	7590	07/03/2007	EXAMINER	
STETINA BRUNDA GARRED & BRUCKER 75 ENTERPRISE, SUITE 250 ALISO VIEJO, CA 92656			DESHPANDE, KALYAN K	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3623		
		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		07/03/2007		PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	Application No. <b>10/051,560</b>	Applicant(s) <b>SANDERSON ET AL.</b>
	Examiner <b>Kalyan K. Deshpande</b>	Art Unit <b>3623</b>

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 21 June 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
  - b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
  - (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-20.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.
12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Ronica Jeanty  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3623

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The proposed amendments raise new issues that require further consideration and search. As the proposed amendments will not be entered, the previous rejections stand. As previously asserted, Seal teaches "a method for processing work requests in a system having a central computer containing a web server and a plurality of remote computer workstations coupled to said central computer, said method comprising: a. an Originator creating a work request at a first of said remote computer terminals and transmitting it to a first level for approval" (see column 10 lines 16-34 and column 12 lines 10-47; where a work request is created using the job entry application. The request is submitted for review to the contractors for them to bid. Contractors in turn submit bids responses to be awarded the work requests.), "b. said first level reviewing said work request and, if approved, transmitting it to a third level Group Lead for work assignment" (see column 13 lines 1-10; where contractors submit bids and the bids are reviewed and approved. Once the bid is approved, it is established that the contractor will perform the work requested.), "d. a Facilitator assigned in the preceding step executing said work request" (see column 12 lines 47-67 and column 13 lines 1-10; where a facilitator reviews and assigns the bids.), "e. said third level Group Lead reviewing work performed by said Facilitators, and transmitting approval to said fourth level if satisfactory" (see column 13 lines 28-44; where the job entry application reviews the entire contract details, including the assignment of bids, and schedules performance of the contract.), "h. closing said work request" (see column 11 lines 60-67; where completed tasks and requests are reported and updated in to the master plan. Reporting the tasks as completed is the same as closing the work request.), and "i. an Administrator providing alternate personnel for any unavailable personnel at any one of the first and third levels" (see column 14 lines 39-58; where the scheduler administers the scheduling of tasks and provides available personnel to complete the work request.). Seal fails to teach "a second level Review Board reviewing said work request", "a fourth level Review Board reviewing work performed by Facilitator", and "a fifth level reviewing work performed by Facilitator". It is old and well-known in the art to have additional personnel (2nd, 4th, and 5th level review) to review service requests to ensure the service request is approvable and classified and routed properly. The advantages of having additional personnel review the service request are that the service request is fully considered by more personnel and the service request is properly classified and routed. It would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, for one of ordinary skill in the art to include a second level review board to the Seal system in order to have the service request fully considered by additional personnel and to have the service request more accurately classified and routed.